UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                | FILING DATE                       | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/552,450                     | 10/07/2005                        | Satoru Ejiri         | Q90623              | 2310             |
| 23373<br>SUGHRUE MI            | 7590 10/01/200<br><b>ON. PLLC</b> | EXAMINER             |                     |                  |
| 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. |                                   |                      | BARON, HENRY        |                  |
|                                | SUITE 800<br>WASHINGTON, DC 20037 |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                                |                                   |                      | 2416                |                  |
|                                |                                   |                      |                     |                  |
|                                |                                   |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|                                |                                   |                      | 10/01/2009          | PAPER            |

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|   | Application No.   | Applicant(s)   |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Occurrence  | 10/552,450  | EJIRI, SATORU  |  |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary   | Examiner  | Art Unit   |  |  |  |  |
|   | HENRY BARON   | 2416   |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app<br>Period for Reply  | ears on the cover sheet with the c  | orrespondence address  |  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim 11 apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from 12 cause the application to become ABANDONEI | ely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133). |  |  |  |  |
| Status  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 Ar</u>   | oril 2009   |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | _ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar   |   | secution as to the merits is   |  |  |  |  |
|   | closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are pending in the application.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| ,—  | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are rejected.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or   | election requirement.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Application Papers  | ·   |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine  |   | -<br>-<br>-<br>-<br>-  |  |  |  |  |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some color None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul> |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attachmont/s)   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) Interview Summary  | (PTO-413)  |  |  |  |  |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Da   | te   |  |  |  |  |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date  5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  Other:   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 apor 110(0)/111ain Date   |   |  |  |  |  |  |

Application/Control Number: 10/552,450 Page 2

Art Unit: 2416

## **Detailed** Action

RADIO NETWORK CONTROL DEVICE AND QOS CONTROL METHOD USED FOR THE SAME

## Response to Arguments/Remarks

- 1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 7, 2008 has been entered.
- 2. Claims 1 15 are pending in the application with claims 1 and 5 amended.
- 3. Applicant's arguments filed 04/24/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Examiner finds that the claims, in their current form, as not in condition for allowance, but Examiner is ready to discuss any amendment to the claims that distinctly point out the metes and bounds of claimed subject with the Applicant.
- 4. Applicant argues that the Examiner appears to interpret the Related Art's RNC, base station, and router as the claimed blocks, but the RNC, base station, and router are separate nodes and do not exist within the RNC node. Further, Applicant argues, the related Art does not teach an RNC which includes a UDP/IPv6 layer between a plurality of protocols forming blocks which exist within the RNC node, but a UDP/IPv6 protocol which is arranged between nodes and connects the different nodes to the RNC.
- 5. Applicant, further argues, that the subsequent claims, 2 15 are allowable because claim 1 is allowable.
- 6. Applicant's arguments filed 10/03/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 7. Examiner replies that UDP/IPv6 layer, a set of software instructions and as part of the Open System Interconnection Reference Model (OSI) (layer 4 transport UDP and layer 3 network IPv6) can be implemented inter-node or intra node. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to

Application/Control Number: 10/552,450 Page 3

Art Unit: 2416

implement to includes UDP/IPv6 layer between a plurality of protocols forming blocks within an RNC or like node since the functionality of the layers within the protocols forming blocks can remain intact, without requisite re-coding) where the intra-node UDP/IPv6 layer can be used as 'glue' to connect the respective blocks.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - a. A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 9. Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art, hereafter APA.
- 10. With regards to claim 1, APA teaches a radio network controller including a plurality of protocol layers, which comprises a plurality of blocks each formed of protocol layers obtained by segmenting said plurality of protocol layers and a UDP (User Datagram Protocol)/IPv6 (Internet Protocol version 6) layer which connects said plurality of blocks. (See Figure 6 and 1: [0004] read FIG. 6 shows a protocol stack of a U (User)-plane when an IP based UTRAN directly connects to an IP network. Shown in FIG. 6 is a protocol stack among a base station (Node B), a radio network controller (RNC) and a router as nodes which form the UTRAN. Here, the U-plane is for transferring user information. Note in Figure 6 user IP layer is IPv6, therefore the UDP layer is UDP (User Datagram Protocol)/IPv6 (Internet Protocol version 6.).
- 11. APA does not disclose where the blocks comprises a first block and a second block, are connected by an User Datagram Protocol (UDP)/ Interact Protocol version 6 (IPv6) layer arranged between.
- 12. Examiner takes official notice that UDP/IPv6 layer, a set of software instructions and part of the Open System Interconnection Reference Model (OSI) (layer 4 transport UDP and layer 3 network IPv6) can be implemented inter-node or intra-node. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art

Art Unit: 2416

to implement to includes UDP/IPv6 layer between a plurality of protocols forming blocks within an RNC or like node since the functionality of the layers within the protocols forming blocks can remain intact, without requisite re-coding where the intra-node UDP/IPv6 layer can be used as 'glue' to connect the respective blocks.

- 13. In regards to claim 8, APA teaches of a radio network controller where blocks comprises at three of blocks and where each block are connected by one of a plurality of UDP/IPv6 layers comprising a UDP/IPv6 layer. (Shown in FIG. 6 is a protocol stack among a base station (Node B), a radio network controller (RNC) and a router as nodes which form the UTRAN i.e. three blocks. Here, the U-plane is for transferring user information. Note in Figure 6 user IP layer is IPv6, therefore the UDP layer is UDP (User Datagram Protocol)/IPv6 (Internet Protocol version 6) used to connect Node B and base station controller blocks.
- 14. Claims 2, 5 6, 9, and 9 11, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art, hereafter APA in view of Yi et al (U.S. Application 20030123485) hereafter Yi.
- 15. Regarding claims 2, 5 6, and 10 11, APA teaches a QoS (Quality of Service) control method of a radio network controller and the limitations of claim 1 and the protocol layers include at least a PDCP (Packet Data Convergence Protocol) layer, an RLC (Radio Link Control) layer and a MAC (Medium Access Control) layer and an FP (Frame Protocol) layer. (Figure 6).
- 16. However, APA does not disclose a RLC (Radio Link Control) layer which executes U (User)-plane data segmentation and concatenation.
- 17. Yi teaches a RLC (Radio Link Control) layer which executes U(User)-plane data segmentation and concatenation, a MAC (Medium Access Control) layer (11: [00167] read [w]hen operated in unacknowledged mode, the RLC layer constructs the RLC PDU using a segmentation and concatenation function for the RLC SDU i.e. U(User)-plane data segmentation and concatenation, adds header information thereto, and transmits it to the receiving party.). Yi does not disclose a FP (Frame Protocol) layer.

- 18. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made by a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the protocol block radio network controller teachings of APA with the UDP/IPv6 teachings of Yi.
- 19. Protocol layers of a radio network controller modified in this manner can be used to rearranges incoming frames over the interface, e.g., the frame handling protocol is modified to include a sequence number field and identifier used for rearranging incoming frames connected using the all of state of the art features of IP/v6 allowing more efficient data management using the UDP layer.
- 20. In regards to claim 9, APA teaches of a radio network controller where blocks comprises at three of blocks and where each block are connected by one of a plurality of UDP/IPv6 layers comprising a UDP/IPv6 layer. (Shown in FIG. 6 is a protocol stack among a base station (Node B), a radio network controller (RNC) and a router as nodes which form the UTRAN i.e. three blocks. Here, the U-plane is for transferring user information. Note in Figure 6 user IP layer is IPv6, therefore the UDP layer is UDP (User Datagram Protocol)/IPv6 (Internet Protocol version 6) used to connect Node B and base station controller blocks.
- 21. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA, in view of Yi et al (U.S. Application 20030123485) hereafter Yi and in further view of Ruutu (U.S. Patent Application 2003/0123392).
- 22. With regards to claim 3, APA modified teaches the limitations of claim 2, but does not disclose the protocol layers segmented to execute QoS (Quality of Service) control taking said RLC layer into consideration.
- 23. Ruutu teaches this limitation in 3: [0039] read the preferred embodiments of the present invention will now be described on the basis of a PDCP layer queuing management and a MAC layer i.e. QoS scheduling function in a Radio Network Controller (RNC) 10 of a 3G network i.e. protocol layers segmented to execute QoS (Quality of Service) control taking said RLC layer into consideration.)

- 24. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made by a person of having ordinary skill in the art to modify the protocol block radio network controller teachings of APA modified with the QoS teachings of Ruutu.
- 25. Incorporating a RLC (Radio Link Control) layer which executes segmentation and concatenation of U(User)-plane data into consideration of QoS control in an RNC (Radio Network Controller Quality of Service allows a DiffServ (Differentiated Services) and service level agreements to be provided to various users.
- 26. Claims 4, 7, and 12 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art, hereafter APA, in view of Yi et al (U.S. Application 20030123485) hereafter Yi, in view of Vilander et al (U.S. Patent 7,302,497) hereafter Vilander and in further view of Mathes (U.S. Patent 4,682,150)
- 27. In consideration of claims 4, 7, and 12 15, APA modified teaches the limitations of claim 2, but does not disclose a filtering function of detecting a start packet and an end packet each set in advance with start packet and end packet excluded to a buffer and abandon the data according to the detection result or and allowing or abandoning the input data based on a result of the comparison..
- 28. Mathes teaches this limitation in Figure 9 and in 4: [0058] read [a]ssociated with the table 110 is the circular buffer 108 (FIG. 9) located in the RAM memory unit 72 (FIG. 4) which includes a plurality of storage locations 134, a start of buffer pointer 136 i.e. start packet and an end of buffer pointer 138 end packet. Included in the pointers 136 and 138 i.e. packets excluded to a buffer and abandon the data according to the detection results (since they are pointers), date 140 and hour 142 storage locations.
- 29. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made by a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the protocol block radio network controller teachings of APA modified with the buffer writing teachings of Mathes.

Application/Control Number: 10/552,450 Page 7

Art Unit: 2416

30. In this manner, blocks of data from the UDP (User Datagram Protocol)/IPv6 (Internet Protocol

version 6) layer within a radio network controller can be efficiently directed to the buffer of a QoS controller

and transmitted to the end user fulfilling the respective Service Level Agreements.

Conclusion

31. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be

directed to HENRY BARON whose telephone number is (571)270-1748. The examiner can normally be

reached on 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM E.S.T. Monday to Friday.

32. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema

Rao can be reached on (571) 272-3174. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or

proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

33. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from

either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at

866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or

access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/H. B./ Examiner, Art Unit 2416

HB

/Kevin C. Harper/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2416